

2003P12502 - Application No. 10/573,539
Response to Office action April 16, 2008
Response submitted June 24, 2008

Remarks/Arguments:

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 14-21 and 23-31 remain in the application. Claim 22 was previously cancelled.

In the second paragraph on page 2 of the above-identified Office action, claims 14 and 22-31 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by Yamada et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0050717 A1) (hereinafter "Yamada") under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

As will be explained below, it is believed that the claims were patentable over the cited art in their original form and the claims have, therefore, not been amended to overcome the references.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful.

Claim 14 calls for, *inter alia*:

the circuit carrier having at least one relatively thin region and a relatively thick region supporting the thin region, the thin region and the thick region being implemented as a molded interconnect device with integrated conductor tracks.

As indicated in the previous response, the reference does not show the circuit carrier having at least one relatively thin region and a relatively thick region supporting the thin region, the thin region and the thick region being implemented as a molded interconnect device with integrated conductor tracks, as recited in claim 14 of the instant application. Yamada discloses a flexible wiring board and a stepped wiring board. Yamada does not disclose that the flexible wiring board and the stepped wiring board, are molded interconnect devices. This is contrary to the invention of the instant application as claimed, in which the circuit carrier has at least one relatively thin region and a relatively thick region supporting the thin region, the thin region and the thick region are implemented as a molded interconnect device with integrated conductor tracks.

The Examiner apparently agrees with the fact that Yamada does not disclose the molded interconnect device and therefore improperly attempts to argue that the molded interconnect as

recited in claim 14 of the instant application is a "Product-by Process" limitation.

Particularly, on page 5 of the Office action the Examiner alleges that "regarding claims 1, applicant is claiming the product including the process of how the two regions are formed through molding methods, and therefore are of 'product by process' nature."

It is respectfully noted that the Examiner is in error.

Specifically, there are no method steps recited in claim 14.

Claim 14 does not recite a molding step. What claim 14 does recite is a "molded interconnect device", which in no way includes the process steps for making the interconnect device. The Examiner's position is akin to incorrectly arguing that a "threaded fastener" or a "chamfered corner" or a "constricted flow path", in a device claim includes the respective process steps of threading the fastener, chamfering the corner, or constricting the flow path, in the product claim. However, this is not done when considering the above-noted product limitations. Therefore, it is not the case that reciting a "molded interconnect device" imparts process steps to the product claim 14. Accordingly, it is respectfully noted that the Examiner's allegation pertaining to the molded

interconnect device including the process steps to make it,
are completely misplaced.

Furthermore, as disclosed on page 6 of the specification of the instant application, MIDs manufactured in whatever manner being able to be used within the scope of the present invention. This disclosure in the specification further supports the fact that the method of production of the molded interconnect device is irrelevant and is absolutely not a part of the device claim 14.

On page 5 of the Office action the Examiner alleges that "a prior art product which possesses the claimed product characteristics can anticipate or render obvious the claim subject matter regardless of the manner in which it is fabricated", is correct. However, this is not the case with respect to the rejection given by the Examiner, as claim 14 **does not include any process steps**. Particularly, as seen from the above-given remarks, the limitation of a molded interconnect device with integrated conductor tracks **is strictly a product limitation** and in no way introduces process limitations to the claim. Moreover, it is decisive that the prior art does not meet the required product limitation of "a molded interconnect device with integrated conductor tracks",

2003P12502 - Application No. 10/573,539
Response to Office action April 16, 2008
Response submitted June 24, 2008

as recited in claim 14 of the instant application and
therefore does not read on the claim.

Since claim 14 is allowable over Yamada, dependent claims 23-
31 are allowable over Yamada as well.

In the fourth paragraph on page 3 of the Office action, claims
14, 16-19, and 21 have been rejected as being fully
anticipated by Hoshino et al. (EP 1081944 A2) (hereinafter
"Hoshino") under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

As noted in the previous response, claim 14 has been amended
to include the subject matter of claim 22. Since claim 22 was
not rejected over Hoshino, claim 14 is allowable over Hoshino.
Since claim 14 is allowable over Hoshino, dependent claims 16-
19 and 21 are allowable over Hoshino as well. It is noted
that the Examiner did not acknowledge or respond the fact that
claim 14 was amended as noted.

In the first paragraph on page 4 of the Office action, claim
15 has been rejected as being obvious over Yamada (U.S. Patent
Application Publication No. 2001/0050717 A1) in view of
Nakajoh (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0025825
A1) (hereinafter "Nakajoh") under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Nakajoh

2003P12502 - Application No. 10/573,539
Response to Office action April 16, 2008
Response submitted June 24, 2008

does not make up for the deficiencies of Yamada. Since claim 14 is allowable, dependent claim 15 is allowable as well.

In the last paragraph on page 4 of the Office action, claim 20 has been rejected as being obvious over Yamada (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0050717 A1) in view of Kothmeier (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0193609 A1) under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Kothmeier does not make up for the deficiencies of Yamada. Since claim 14 is allowable, dependent claim 20 is allowable as well.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claim 14. Claim 14 is, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art and since all of the dependent claims are ultimately dependent on claim 14, they are believed to be patentable as well.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 14-21 and 23-31 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel respectfully requests a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

2003P12502 - Application No. 10/573,539
Response to Office action April 16, 2008
Response submitted June 24, 2008

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition
for extension is herewith made.

Please charge any other fees which might be due with respect
to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner
Greenberg Stemer LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

/Alfred K. Dassler/

Alfred K. Dassler
Reg. No.: 52,794

AKD:sa

June 24, 2008

Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101